



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,998	03/26/2004	Ling Su	16055US01	8997
<div>7590 04/24/2009 CHRISTOPHER C. WINSLADE MCANDREWS, HELD &amp; MALLOY, LTD. 34th Floor 500 West Madison St. Chicago, IL 60661</div>			<div>EXAMINER SAMS, MATTHEW C</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 2617</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE 04/24/2009</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/16/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. In response to the Applicant's argument regarding claims 42 and 57 that "Lane does not use two or more priority signals to control prioritization" (Pages 9-10), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant has admitted that Lane's teaches a first priority signal that "the BT MAC 130 transmits a transmit disable command to the 802.11 radio 160 whenever the BT MAC 130 needs to process a high-priority BT receive or transmit event". (Lane Col. 5 lines 16-23 and Applicant's Arguments Pages 9-10) However, prior to disable command, Lane teaches the "BT MAC 130 receives information from the 802.11 MAC 170 regarding the priority of the 802.11 events". (Col. 4 lines 64-66) These are two separate priority signals between the MAC interfaces in order to resolve collisions, to prevent saturation of the Bluetooth devices (Col. 3 lines 6-8) and to ensure no physical damage occurs to the Bluetooth device. (Col. 2 lines 59-61)

Further, it appears to the Examiner that the Applicant is confusing two related topics, priority signals and the order (sometimes inherently) determined by the transmission of priority signals (*i.e.* the highest priority signal is an example of an inherent order). The Applicant is focusing on Lane's teaching of "the BT MAC 130 transmits a transmit disable command to the 802.11 radio 160 whenever the BT MAC 130 needs to process a high-priority BT receive or transmit event" (Lane Col. 5 lines 16-23 and Applicant's Arguments Pages 9-10) as being the only priority signal generated.

In order to clarify the issue, the Examiner is looking at the related teachings of Liang. Liang discloses that typically "voice transmission and reception over Bluetooth is given priority over all other data traffic" (Liang Page 3 [0024]), but when the Bluetooth is not seeking to transmit/receive voice data, a priority scheme is used to determine whether to give access to the WLAN/802.11 radio or Bluetooth radio. (Liang Page 3 [0024]) Therefore, since not all Bluetooth transmissions are voice data, there are times (as explained in both Lane Col. 4 line 39 through Col. 5 line 51 and Liang Page 3 [0024 & 0027]) when the 802.11 radio will have priority over the Bluetooth radio and vice versa once the MACs have determined the priority of the transmissions from the at least two priority signals. (Lane Col. 4 lines 64-66, Col. 5 lines 16-17 and Col. 5 lines 20-23)

3. In response to the applicant's arguments regarding the dependent claims, the applicant's arguments are based on the alleged deficiency of claims 42 and 57, responded to above. Therefore, the rejection is maintained in view of the further explanation above.

/MATTHEW SAMS/

Examiner, Art Unit 2617